



LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW  
CORPORATION  
17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE, SUITE 38-E  
IRVINE CA 92614

**MAILED**  
**FEB 15 2011**  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 5,803,073	:	
Issue Date: September 8, 1998	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Application No. 08/613,070	:	
Filed: March 8, 1996	:	
Attorney Docket No. ATOMIC-2	:	

This is a decision in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed December 22, 2010, to accept the unavoidably delayed payment of the maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The patent issued on September 8, 1998. The maintenance fee could have been paid during the period from September 8, 2005 through March 8, 2006, or with a surcharge during the period from March 9, 2006 through September 8, 2006. Accordingly, this patent expired on September 9, 2006, for failure to timely remit the maintenance fee.

A grantable petition to accept a delayed maintenance fee payment under 37 CFR 1.378(b) must include the following:

- (1) the required maintenance fee set forth in § 1.20(e) through (g);
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.20(i)(1); and
- (3) a showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

The present petition lacks items (1), (2) and (3).

The USPTO finance record reveals that the Deposit Account contains insufficient funds to charge the \$1,240.00 maintenance fee due at 7.5 years, the \$2,055.00 maintenance fee due at 11.5 years, and the \$700.00 surcharge after expiration. The Office notes that the maintenance fees, as well as the required surcharge, must be paid as a condition for accepting the late maintenance fee on petition.

In view of the above, the Office is unable to treat the present petition on the merits until petitioner submits a new petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), the payment for the surcharge after expiration (currently \$700.00), the maintenance fees due at 7.5 and 11.5 years, **as well as documentary evidence in support of a showing of unavoidable delay.** Thus, the petition is dismissed. The Office reminds petitioner that the fees must be paid in the amount due on the date the new petition is filed.

Although the Office will not address the petition on its merits, the Office reminds petitioner that 35 U.S.C. 41(c) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some response to a specific action by the Office under 35 U.S.C. 133, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence would have taken steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees. Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 609, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1788 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

That is, an adequate showing that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee at issue was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees for this patent. Id. Thus, where the record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps, or discloses that the patentee took no steps, to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) preclude acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee under 37 CFR 1.378(b).

Acceptance of a late maintenance fee under the unavoidable delay standard is considered under the same standard for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. 133. This is a very stringent standard. Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 667-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd,

143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987). Moreover, patentee's lack of knowledge of the need to pay the maintenance fee and the failure to receive the Maintenance Fee Reminder do not constitute unavoidable delay. See Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

In determining whether the delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person. Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-609, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The patent owner at the time of the expiration of the patent is ultimately the person responsible to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees. The patent owner may engage another to track and/or pay the maintenance fees; however, merely engaging another does not relieve the patent owner from his obligation to take appropriate steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees. See California Medical Prods. v. Tecnol Medical Prods., 921 F. Supp. 1219 (D. Del. 1995). Moreover, the USPTO must rely on the actions or inactions of duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representatives of an applicant, and an applicant is bound by the consequences of those actions or inactions. Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-34 (1962); Huston v. Ladner, 973 F.2d 1564, 1567, 23 USPQ2d 1910, 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Specifically, delay caused by the actions or inactions of a voluntarily chosen representative does not constitute unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (D. Ind. 1987).

In the present petition, petitioner asserted that over a protracted period beginning in 2005, counsel's office manager, Ms. Foreman, experienced a medical condition that caused her to fail in her office duties which included notifying the patentee of the need to pay the maintenance fees, obtaining the client's authorization to pay the maintenance fee, and proceeding to send the payment to the USPTO. In support of the petition, petitioners provided a statement from patent practitioner Leonard Tachner, office manager Ms. Foreman, and Dr. Samuel A. Albert.

To establish a showing of "unavoidable" delay based upon medical incapacitation, petitioner must demonstrate that the incapacitation was of such a nature and degree as to render the person unable to conduct business (e.g., correspond with the USPTO) during the period when the maintenance fee was due. Such a showing must be supported by a statement(s) from the person's treating physician(s), and such statement(s) must provide the nature and degree of the person's medical condition during the period from when the maintenance was due until the filing of a grantable petition. Namely, petitioner should provide the USPTO with a statement from a treating physician, asserting that from the time the maintenance fee was due until the filing of a grantable petition, the person's medical condition was of such a degree of severity that it prevented her from timely paying the maintenance fee. Additionally, the treating physician must describe the person's medical condition, the degree of incapacitation, and the duration of the medical illness. Lastly, petitioner should submit evidence to show that "but for" the person's medical condition, the maintenance fee would have been timely paid. Without a thorough

explanation or documentary evidence, the Office is left to speculate as to the circumstances that transpired.

The Office cautions petitioner to remove or mark through any personal information in any document submitted to the USPTO that could contribute to identity theft. Personal information such as social security numbers, bank account numbers, or credit card numbers (other than a check or credit card authorization form PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes) is never required by the USPTO to support a petition or an application. If this type of personal information is included in documents submitted to the USPTO, petitioner should consider deleting such personal information from the documents before submitting them to the USPTO. Petitioner is advised that the patent file is available to the public after the issuance of a patent. However, checks and credit card authorization forms (PTO-2038) submitted for payment purposes are not retained in the application file, and therefore, are not publicly available.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                Mail Stop Petition  
                          Commissioner for Patents  
                          P.O. Box 1450  
                          Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:                (571) 273-8300  
                          Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:               Customer Services Window  
                          Randolph Building  
                          401 Dulany Street  
                          Alexandria, VA 22314

Correspondence may also be submitted electronically via EFS-Web.

The patent file is being returned to Files Repository.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3211.



Christina Tartera Donnell  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions